**REMARKS**

This Response responds to the Office Action dated August 2, 2010 in which the

Examiner rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 1 claims a dialog control device, claim 19 claims a dialog control method and

claim 36 claims a robot. The device, method and robot customize dialog between a user and the

robot. A memory stores various pieces of information appendant to an object as values

corresponding to respective items of the object. The various pieces of information are acquired

by the robot by one of voice recognition and visual recognition of a user. A conversation

generating means selects, in response to an item about the object defined as a topic about the

user, another topic about the user relating to the topic used in the immediately preceding

conversation. The conversation generating means generates (a) an acquisition conversation or

(b) a utilization conversation. The acquisition conversation acquires the value of the item

selected as the topic. The utilization conversation utilizes the value of the item, in the topic

already stored in the memory, as the next conversation. The conversation generating means is

adapted to store the acquired information, acquired in the acquisition conversation, as the value

of the corresponding item. The dialog control device makes a conversation with the user that is

customized for the user.

By (a) acquiring various pieces of information by one of voice recognition and visual

recognition of a user and (b) selecting another topic about the user related to the topic used in the

immediately preceding conversation, as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36, the claimed invention

provides a dialog control device, method and robot which has a conversation with a user that is

customized for the user. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed

in claims 1, 19 and 36.

2

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Fukui, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,918,222) in view of *Freeman* (U.S. Patent No. 5,340,317).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

*Fukui, et al.* appears to disclose an information provider prepares an information provider model having topics as axes (see Figure 94) (column 46, lines 15-16). The agent retrieves user information in step S402 in Figure 90. The user information such as the right of access and a degree of familiarity for a topic is traced on the information provider model axis to form a territory (T) serving as a disclosure enable range for a specific user, thereby forming a personal relationship model. A radar chart in Figure 94 is an example of the personal relationship model. When the information provider and the user are more intimate, the number of shared topics is large, and the degree of details increases. The information disclosure range T of a user having a higher intimacy comes closer to the sanctuary (S). To the contrary, the information disclosure range T of a user having a lower intimacy is always from the center 0, resulting in disclosure of only general topics. The information disclosure range changes depending on the types of users and topics. This user model can be patterned in accordance with the territorial features. Figures 96A through 96D show pattern examples. For example, since the disclosure information is managed in a tree structure, a category to which each disclosure information belongs is clearly known. Pieces of disclosure information are classified into information derived from individual information, information derived from an organizational business operation, and highly public information. For example, in the model shown in Figures 94 and 95, the topic axes of the

00810600.DOC

disclosure information, *i.e.*, schedule, machine-network, machine-hard, machine-soft, report, sports, travel, music, belong to business operation information. The topic axes, *i.e.*, sports, travel, music, belong to private information (column 46, lines 30-60).

Thus, *Fukui, et al.* only discloses classifying pieces of disclosure information into information derived from individual information, information derived from an organizational business operation and highly public information. Nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests acquiring various pieces of information by one of <u>voice recognition and visual recognition of a user</u> as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36. Rather, *Fukui, et al.* only discloses information derived from individual information, from an organizational business operation and highly public information.

Furthermore, *Fukui, et al.* merely discloses in Figure 94 personal relationship model between information provider and user B including disclosed information, limit on non-disclosed information, limit of disclosed information to user and interactive operation history. Nothing in *Fukui, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests selecting another topic about a user related to a topic used in an <u>immediately preceding conversation</u> as claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36. Rather, Figure 94 of *Fukui, et al.* only discloses a personal relationship model between information provider and user B.

*Freeman* appears to disclose multiple choice input may be provided by any appropriate device to select a channel of the conversation for output. If a microprocessor and computer were in use, the multiple choice inputs could be provided via a keyboard or even a touch screen that interrupts to the processor (column 7, lines 9-14). The various information segments on the various tracks related in real-time to content so that an interactive conversation can occur as the media is played back and the child responds to the various interrogatories on the tracks (column

7, lines 48-52). Example 6 question, "Thank you very much for turning me on. I am your toy

robot 2-XL, and this program is called fun and games. It will be my job to provide questions and

games. It will be your job to have fun. As usual, please follow my instructions carefully. Only

press the buttons I tell you to press and only after I say the word NOW. Before we begin, I

would like to know if you are a girl or a boy. If you are a girl, press A. If you are a boy, press B.

Please press A or B NOW" (column 23).

Thus, *Freeman* only discloses pressing buttons in order to have the child response to

questions. Nothing in *Freeman* shows, teaches or suggests acquiring various pieces of

information by one of voice recognition and visual recognition of a user as claimed in claims 1,

19 and 36. Rather, *Freeman* only discloses that the child is instructed to press buttons to respond

to the questions.

A combination of *Fukui, et al.* and *Freeman* would merely suggest classifying pieces of

disclosure information as information derived from individual information, information derived

from an organizational business operation and highly public information as taught by *Fukui, et

al.* and to input information by pressing buttons as taught by *Freeman*. Thus, nothing in the

combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests (a) acquiring various pieces of

information by one of voice recognition and visual recognition of a user and (b) selecting another

topic about the user relating to the topic used in the immediately preceding conversation, as

claimed in claims 1, 19 and 36. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner

withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 19 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2-18 and 20-35 depend from claims 1 and 19 and recite additional features.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-18 and 20-35 would not have been obvious within

the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Fukui, et al.* and *Freeman* at least for the reasons as set

forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-18 and 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enters this Response for purposes of appeal.

00810600.DOC

U.S. Appln. No. 10/536,926
Response to Office Action dated August 2, 2010

PATENT
450100-04849

## CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP

Date:   September 28, 2010

By:

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530